

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUN 21 2005

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

First Named Applicant: Plow	)	Art Unit: 2132
	)	
Serial No.: 09/922,196	)	Examiner: Ungar
	)	
Filed: August 2, 2001	)	SVL920000036US1
	)	
For: SYSTEM, METHOD, AND COMPUTER	)	June 21, 2005
PROGRAM PRODUCT FOR AUTOMATICALLY	)	750 B STREET, Suite 3120
INPUTTING USER DATA INTO INTERNET	)	San Diego, CA 92101
BASED ELECTRONIC FORMS	)	

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTIONCommissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, DC 20231

Dear Sir:

This responds to the Office Action dated May 24, 2005, rejecting Claims 1-4, 9-12, 14, 17-19, 21, and 24-26 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Pennell et al., USPP 2002/0013788, and rejecting Claims 5-8, 13, 15, 16, 20, 22, 23, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Pennell et al. in view of Kikinis, USPN 5,794,259.

It appears that a subtle yet important difference exists between Pennell et al. and, e.g., Claim 1. In Claim 1, "the form" is the data structure received from the server. User information that is stored in memory is automatically input to this form, i.e., the form received from the server. This user information is updated in response to the user manually inputting data to the form, i.e., the form received from the server.

In contrast, the window 401 that is part of the user computer of Pennell et al. is what is used for autofilling the underlying form 100 from the server, paragraph 27. The window 401 itself may be

11764AM1